



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Michael Korus

EXAMINER: Pham, B.

PARENT SERIAL NO.: 08/957,095

GROUP: 2731

PARENT FILED: 10/24/97

CASE NO.: CM03704HC01

TITLED: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING BROADCAST GROUP DATA



Motorola, Inc.
Corporate Offices
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Schaumburg, IL 60196
August 22, 2000

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated March 15, 2000 (Paper No. 5) for the parent case of the present application, please enter the following response:

REMARKS

1. In the above-captioned Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 3, 7, 9, and 16. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,245). Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Tanaka in view of Fox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,636,216). Claims 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Fox in view of Uppaluru (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,844). These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

2. Some of the Examiner's rejections in the above-captioned Office Action are unclear and/or unspecified. Although the Examiner states that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-15, and 17-26 are all rejected in the Office Action Summary, with respect to claims 10, 11, and 18, the Examiner simply states "Consider claims [number(s)] in view of [reference(s)]." It is unclear whether these are rejections or not. Because claims 10, 11, and 18 were discussed with respect to Tanaka and Fox, the Applicant is responding herein to those claims as if they were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) given Tanaka in view of Fox in order to advance the prosecution of this

003280-2054960